

Rollins College Rollins Scholarship Online

College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes

College of Arts and Sciences Minutes

9-23-2008

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Tuesday, Sept. 23, 2008

Arts & Sciences Faculty

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Tuesday, Sept. 23, 2008" (2008). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 48.

http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/48

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

**Approved Minutes
Arts and Sciences Faculty Meeting
Tuesday, September 23, 2008**



Members Present: Vidhu Aggarwal, Barry Allen, Joshua Almond, Mark Anderson, Gabriel Barreneche, Pedro Bernal, Alexander Boguslawski, Bill Boles, Rick Brommelje, Dexter Boniface, Wendy Brandon, Sharon Carnahan, Roger Casey, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Julian Chambliss, David Charles, Martha Cheng, Ed Cohen, Gloria Cook, Tom Cook, Denise Cummings, Mario D'Amato, Alice Davidson, Creston Davis, Don Davison, Joan Davison, Nancy Decker, Kimberly Dennis, Rosana Diaz-Zambrana, Jalh Dulanto, Lewis Duncan, James Eck, Hoyt Edge, Nicola Edwards, Larry Eng-Wilmot, Richard Foglesong, Laurel Goj, Elton Graugnard, Yudit Greenberg, Eileen

Gregory, Mike Gunter, Dana Hargrove, Fiona Harper, Paul Harris, Alicia Homrich, John Houston, Gordie Howell, Richard James, Peg Jarnigan, Jim Johnson, Jill Jones, Laurie Joyner, Ashley Kistler, Steve Klemann, Madeline Kovarik, Philip Kozel, Harry Kypraios, Susan Lackman, Carol Lauer, Christina Lee, Ed LeRoy, Barry Levis, Richard Lewin, Susan Libby, Lee Lines, Dorothy Mays, Edna McClellan, Cecilia McInnis-Bowers, Margaret McLaren, Jonathan Miller, Al Moe, Thom Moore, Ryan Musgrave, Rachel Newcomb, Marvin Newman, Alan Nordstrom, Kathryn Norsworthy, Thomas Ouellette, Rhonda Ovist, Twila Papay, Kenneth Pestka, Jennifer Queen, Roger Ray, Charlie Rock, Dawn Roe, Don Rogers, Ed Royce, Scott Rubarth, Emily Russell, Eric Schutz, Marie Shafe, Rachel Simmons, John Sinclair, Chris Skelley, Jim Small, Eric Smaw, Bob Smither, Steven St. John, Bruce Stephenson, Paul Stephenson, Darren Stoub, Claire Strom, Kathryn Sutherland, Mary Throumoulos, Lisa Tillmann, Patricia Tome, Larry Van Sickle, Robert Vander Poppen, Rick Vitray, Tonia Warnecke, Debra Wellman, Yusheng Yao, Jay Yellen

Guests: Sharon Carrier, Marissa Germain, Rod Romesburg

- I. Call to Order—Davison called the Meeting to order at 12:38 PM.

- II. Approval of Minutes—The minutes of the April 30, 2008 meeting were approved as distributed.
- III. Announcements—Davison announced that Duncan would hold a forum on moving Rollins College from good to great on October 2. Davison also announced the faculty party on October 10.
- IV. Old Business

None
- V. New Business
 - 1. Proposed Pilot for General Education—Academic Affairs Committee moved by Brandon as distributed (see attachment 1). Brandon yielded to Cook, chair of the Curriculum Review Committee. Cook discussed various ways that the general education curriculum could be offered. What skills do we want our graduates to obtain? He reviewed the process that the committee had gone through to determine what learning outcomes should be presented to our students. He distributed the learning outcomes documents they want students to have (see Attachment 1). There are four learning outcomes; how can they be delivered through the curriculum? The committee came up with the notion of the Rollins Plan (RP) to be developed by faculty designers to address all these outcomes and reinforce them a second time. He did not think it necessary to review the proposal since it has been introduced in a series of forums. Instead he wanted to present what AAC has in mind for the pilot. The Dean of the Faculty will ask for proposed RPs and then they will be reviewed by the AAC, and two will be chosen for implementation beginning in Fall 2010. The plan is to have 80 students follow the pilot and assess it throughout the process, including an outside assessor and other regular assessment means. After the trial period, the program could be scrapped, re-envisioned and further tested, or approved for all entering students. Eng-Wilmot asked if they planned to begin the program with sophomores. Cook said there were some sentiments for that but in the end the committee thought they could not implement it at the sophomore level for the fall. Vitray asked if the program begins with a writing course. Cook said that that course would begin the program in Spring 2010. Kapraios asked if the pilot will offer all eight courses in the first two years. Lauer explains that there would be one in Freshman year, one in the senior, and the other six in sophomore and

junior years. Joan Davison wondered why natural and social sciences are lumped together. Lauer explained that they were not actually lumped but the committee just saved on a coordinating conjunction. Newcomb asked if there could be more than just two plans. Lauer said that there had been a concern about logistics so that the committee thought they should stick to two. Straub wondered the advisability of evaluating only after half of the program had been completed. He thought it should be evaluated after three years. Anderson replied that the committee wanted to have frequent reports back about how the projects were progressing. Evaluation after three years would not be soon enough. Staub asked if there would be two cohorts going through the curriculum. Lauer said the committee would only be looking at this one group and then if the experiment seems to be going well then they would add a new cohort. Foglesong wondered if there would be a single RP for each entering class. Lauer said that there would be four or five RPs in the full proposal since scaled up to full capacity. Gregory wondered what happened if students drop out. Lauer answered that it would operate the same way as the Honors program: they will be dropped back into the regular general education program. It should not be a problem. Harris felt that the faculty was signing a blank check since they do not know yet what the courses will be or the evaluation process. Cook responded by reminding the faculty that they have a series of possible examples. He hoped that by February the committee would have the RPs lined up. He felt the timeline might encourage proposals because they would have to be vetted by February. Brandon explained that the faculty was only voting on structure and process, not the actual courses. The approval of the courses would follow the same procedure through the governance process to choose the RPs in the same way that other courses are approved. Harris said that this process goes far beyond a single course, because it consists of eight courses for eighty students. Anderson retorted that the same system works with the honors program. The AAC does not approve individual courses but the overall program. Carnahan suggested that the RPs seemed more like a major and so have it come back to the faculty. Lauer responded that she saw a problem with the full faculty approval because this is a pilot program. Would we need faculty approval for a pilot course? Such a requirement would slow the process down considerably. Ovist argued that Lauer might be oversimplifying. We have the same set of skills but the delivery is slightly different. Criteria by which courses are judged should therefore be appropriate, since the same committee that currently approves courses would approve the new pilot. Boguslawski wondered how we would know what skills were being covered in other courses. Anderson thought this was an important aspect of the plan because it would require faculty across different divisions to work these out. Brandon said the procedures established in the proposal

would handle this. Anderson replied that individuals cannot create an RP; it must result from a collaboration of faculty members. Rubarth agreed with Ovist that we already have a mechanism for approval. Libby asked if one could teach a course that has already been taught and fit it into the RP. If that is the case than she did not see it as radical change. Cook hoped that it will not be just the same course but the discussions will lead to adjustments and rethinking. McLaren stated that we have to separate structure from content. We are approving the pilot and not the content. ACC has always taken care of course approval. She felt confident that the two layers of oversight will make certain the quality is appropriate. Edge saw that there will be a number of unknowns, and the only way to see what they might be is to try the pilot. He thought the RP could be brought back again in some forum for the faculty to discuss although not necessarily to vote on again. Our current general education program currently has no focus. This program has focus which is very important. Also we now have no developmental sequencing. This proposal has sequential development. The aims are pretty much what we have already in place. Jones wanted to remind everyone that this is pilot and called the question. The question was called by a vote of 71 to 18. The pilot was endorsed by voice vote. Davison thanked the curriculum committee for its hard work

2. Rock moved to create a committee of eight faculty with representatives of two members from each division to serve as the review committee to consult with the AAC for selecting these proposals. Lackman responded that we already have a governance system in place that represents the divisions. She did not see the need for another committee. Hoyt asked if there was already. Gregory thought that Rock had made a good proposal because there are also “at large” members on the committee that tilts AAC in certain directions. She did not see why his proposal was bad. Casey says the majority of the faculty respects the members of AAC and therefore called the question. The question was called and the motion defeated. Rock called for division of the house but Davison declined. Saying that the motion was clearly defeated by overwhelming voice vote.

VI. Reports

1. Survey results of strategic planning priorities from A & S faculty— Finance and Services Committee—Davison reminded the faculty of the establishment of Budget and Planning process about three years ago. Davison thought it would be helpful to identify the priorities of the A&S faculty. Joyner had sent out a survey to gather that information. The surveys are still coming in but he thought it would be appropriate for a report from F&S to discuss the preliminary results.

Gunter has just received the results of the survey but quite a bit of qualitative responses need to be considered.

2. The Executive committee approved Barry Allen to fill a vacancy on the F&S committee.
3. Norsworthy reported on the workshop on Recruitment and Retention of faculty of color. She plans to make further information available on a web site to assist faculty in their searches. She asked for faculty acclamation to the following statement: Toward the larger goal of creating a fully inclusive Rollins community, we the faculty affirm the goal of developing and IMPLEMENTING a strategic, institutional plan for recruitment and retention of faculty and staff of color and other historically under-represented groups.
4. Tillman announced education session on Amendment 2 this evening. She said the amendment would strip public service employees of domestic partner benefits.
5. Cummings thanked those who participated in the Peace Film Festival.
6. Davison announced that there would be a meeting on Friday held by the Merit Pay Task.

VII. Adjournment—the meeting was adjourned at 1:48 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis
Secretary

Attachment 1

“The Rollins Plan” General Education Curriculum Pilot Program

Implementation of the pilot General Education Curriculum comprised of 2 “Rollins Plans” designed by Faculty

- AAC will issue a call for “Rollins Plan” (RP) proposals from interested faculty
- The RP proposals must adhere to the new General Education “Learning Outcomes” Curriculum and RP Guidelines developed by the Curriculum Renewal and Revision Committee (CRRC)
- The AAC will select 2 RP proposals from among those submitted to implement as a pilot General Education Curriculum beginning Fall 2009
- The pilot Curriculum will be offered to 80 students for 2 years in lieu of the current general education graduation requirements

Trial Period and Evaluation of Rollins Plan General Education Curriculum

- An external program evaluator will provide ongoing review and report on the pilot Curriculum to the AAC and the Faculty
- The AAC will apprise the faculty on the status of the pilot Curriculum each semester
- Faculty will vote to stop, expand, modify, and/or continue the pilot Curriculum in Fall Semester 2011.

Attachment 2

Mission Statement of the Arts & Sciences College

Our mission is to provide a rigorous liberal arts baccalaureate education of the highest quality, encouraging in our faculty pedagogical innovation and continued professional growth, and fostering in our students both the intellectual curiosity that underlies a desire for lifelong education and the practice of making principled, ethical decisions for functioning as responsible citizens and workers in a global society.

Core Competencies

1. To obtain knowledge of the distinctive methodologies and subject matter of the sciences, social sciences, arts, and humanities,
2. Ability to read, think, write, and speak critically and analytically,
3. Ability to identify and articulate ethical dimensions of a personal or social issue.

Faculty Guidelines for Developing the “Rollins Plan” Proposal

With the A&S College Mission Statement in mind organize RP around a Big Idea/Theme

Choose/Develop a set of 8 courses with active links between fields of knowledge, balanced across divisions that address all RP “Learning Outcomes”

Designate 8 courses as a balanced mix of 100 to 400 level, including a capstone

Identify the “Learning Outcomes” to be introduced, taught, and/or reinforced in each course and at each level.

Provide two variants for most courses that are on different topics but address the same learning outcomes

Demonstrate that each learning outcome is introduced in one course and reinforced in at least one other course at the same or at a different level

Identify goals and assessment measures for each of the learning outcomes

Use the RP Matrix to demonstrate the courses address all learning outcomes multiple times

Include a “Writing About” for Spring Semester of the First Year

Integrate the co-curriculum into the RP where appropriate

Decide how the RP will develop/reinforce quantitative and foreign-language literacy after students have demonstrated basic competency.

Rollins Plan General Education Learning Outcomes

I. Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World

To obtain knowledge of the distinctive methodologies and subject matter of the

- A. Natural and social sciences
- B. Expressive arts
- C. Humanities

II. Intellectual and Practical skills

To read, think, and communicate critically, creatively, and analytically in a variety of forms utilizing a multiplicity of forms of expression and literacies.

- A. Inquiry, analysis, and problem solving (individual and collaborative)
- B. Critical reading and thinking
- C. Creative thinking
- D. Written communication
- E. Oral communication
- F. Quantitative literacy
- G. Information literacy
- H. Bilingual literacy

III. Personal and Social Responsibility

Civic knowledge (local and global)
Civic engagement
Respect for and knowledge of diverse peoples and non-western cultures
Ethical reasoning and action

IV. Integrative Learning

To synthesize and apply knowledge, skills and responsibilities to new settings and cultures, and to complex local and global problems